



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,542	04/09/2001	Marc Georges Girardot	ARC920000045US1	7509
26381	7590	07/26/2005	EXAMINER	
LACASSE & ASSOCIATES, LLC 1725 DUKE STREET SUITE 650 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			HO, ANDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

87

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/828,542

Applicant(s)

GIRARDOT ET AL.

Examiner

Andy Ho

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/14/2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 4/14/2005.
2. Claims 1-44 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 12-14, 16-30 and 37-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally U.S Patent No. 6,772,216 in view of Admitted Prior Arts (APA).

As to claim 17, Ankireddipally teaches a system for performing remote procedure calls utilizing a markup language as a marshalling format (...the application interaction protocol, data, object and method invocation requests are exchanged between applications by means of structured documents that use XML tags and that are consistent with the protocol..., lines 9-12 column 7) in which a server receives a request for a remote procedure call including a method name and associated parameters (...requesting application 34 sends a request message 90 to service application 20. Request message 90 encodes service invocation semantics in the message. The SERVICE attribute of the CONTROL section specifies the target service, and the INPUT

Art Unit: 2194

element of the DATA section contains arguments required to perform the service..., lines 9-14 column 18) in the form of a request markup language document (XML document, lines 16 column 15), said server invokes a method corresponding to said method name and transmits a response markup language document containing return parameters returned from said invoked method (method invocation request from the client, line 10 column 7; ...upon receipt of the request message, the server party processes it in a predetermined manner and sends back a reply message containing the results..., lines 48-51 column 7; ...transportation/communication module 50 receives XML document 40 as TCP/IP data and returns an XML document..., lines 17-19 column 15; ...service application 20 sending a Reply message 92 to originating application 34 after completion of and in response to the service invoked by request message 90. A Reply message 92 may include input and output parameters, service results, request status, and other application-specific data..., lines 17-22 column 18), said system comprising:

a client passed said method name and associated parameters for said remote procedure call (...requesting application 34 sends a request message 90 to service application 20. Request message 90 encodes service invocation semantics in the message. The SERVICE attribute of the CONTROL section specifies the target service, and the INPUT element of the DATA section contains arguments required to perform the service..., lines 9-14 column 18);

said client generating said request markup language document (XML document lines 16 column 15; ...transportation/communication module 50 receives XML document

Art Unit: 2194

40 as TCP/IP data and returns an XML document..., lines 17-19 column 15) including said method name and associated parameters and sending said document to said server (...requesting application 34 sends a request message 90 to service application 20. Request message 90 encodes service invocation semantics in the message. The SERVICE attribute of the CONTROL section specifies the target service, and the INPUT element of the DATA section contains arguments required to perform the service..., lines 9-14 column 18). Ankireddipally does not explicitly teach the XML request markup language document is encoded in a tokenized format.

APA teaches the advantages of encoding XML wherein tokens are matched to XML tags and attribute names (lines 3-8 page 6). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of APA to the system of Ankireddipally because this allows the XML documents to be transferred in compression form. The system of Ankireddipally as modified by APA would include the XML request markup language document is encoded in a tokenized format, thereby allowing the system to reduce bandwidth usage because the XML document is transferred in compression form.

As to claim 18, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches a transport protocol for transmitting said request markup language document is HTTP (...service application 228 is an application hosted by Web server 220 that accepts perhaps XML documents using Web client-server protocol HTTP..., lines 32-35 column 20).

As to claim 19, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches request markup language document is transmitted as the body of a HTTP-POST message (...service application 228 is an application hosted by Web server 220 that accepts perhaps XML

Art Unit: 2194

documents using Web client-server protocol HTTP..., lines 32-35 column 20; ...HTTP includes a number of different types of messages that may be sent from a client to a server to request different types of server actions..., lines 29-31 column 25).

As to claim 20, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches the markup language is XML (XML document, lines 16 column 15).

As to claim 21, it is a system claim of claim 17. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17 above. Ankireddipally as modified further teaches a parser for receiving, parsing and presenting said response markup language document containing return parameters to said client (...in application 34, XML/DOM module 52 receives the XML document output produced from transportation/communication module 50, parses the document and returns one or more DOM objects that are passed to application logic 54 for handling as standard program objects..., lines 19-24 column 15).

As to claim 22, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches the parser implements an event-based API (XML/DOM 52, Fig. 2; ...this application architecture makes use of the Document Object Model (DOM), a platform- and language-neutral application programming interface API for HTML and XML documents that models these documents using objects..., lines 46-50 column 14; ...subscribe message is used to request notification of a specific event..., lines 3-4 column 19).

As to claim 23, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches the parser translates the tokens of said tokenized response document into strings and presents said response document to said client as said strings (...in application 34, XML/DOM module

52 receives the XML document output produced from transportation/communication module 50, parses the document and returns one or more DOM objects that are passed to application logic 54 for handling as standard program objects..., lines 19-24 column 15).

As to claim 24, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches parser translates the tokens into said strings using a code space generated offline (protocol parsing instructions 166, Fig. 20; lines 16-38 column 24).

As to claim 25, it is a system claim of claim 17. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17 above.

As to claim 26, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches the parser implements a tree-based API (XML/DOM 52, Fig. 2; ...parsing and constructing XML documents, and building and accessing DOM (Document Object Module) object trees..., lines 49-53 column 12;...this application architecture makes use of the DOM, a platform- and language-neutral application programming interface API for HTML and XML documents that models these documents using objects...,lines 46-50 column 14).

As to claims 27-29, they are system claims of claims 23-25, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-4 above.

As to claim 30, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches method name and associated parameters are passed to said client via an invoke method of said client (method invocation, line 10 column 7).

As to claim 1, it is a system claim of claim 17. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17 above. Ankireddipally as modified further teaches a parser

Art Unit: 2194

for parsing said request markup language format document and presenting said document to said server such that said server receives said method name and associated parameters (...in application 20, transportation/communication module 50 receives XML document 40 as TCP/IP data via communications path 25 and returns an XML document. XML/DOM module 56 then receives the XML document output produced from transportation/communication module 50, parses the document and returns one or more DOM objects that are passed to application logic 58 for handling as standard program objects..., lines 24-32 column 15).

As to claim 2, it is a system claim of claim 22. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 22 above.

As to claim 3, Ankireddipally as modified further teaches the parser translates the tokens of said tokenized request document into strings and presents said request document to said server as said strings (...in application 20, transportation/communication module 50 receives XML document 40 as TCP/IP data via communications path 25 and returns an XML document. XML/DOM module 56 then receives the XML document output produced from transportation/communication module 50, parses the document and returns one or more DOM objects that are passed to application logic 58 for handling as standard program objects..., lines 24-32 column 15).

As to claim 4, it is a system claim of claim 24. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24 above.

As to claim 5, it is a system claim of claim 17. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 17 above.

As to claims 6-9, they are system claims of claims 26, 3, 24 and 5, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 26, 3, 24 and 5 above.

As to claims 12-14, they are system claims of claims 18, 20 and 19, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 18, 20 and 19 above.

As to claim 16, it is a system claim of claim 20. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 20 above.

As to claims 37-39, they are method claims of claims 1, 20 and 19, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 20 and 19 above.

As to claim 40, it is a method claim of claims 17 and 21. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 21 above.

As to claims 41-42, they are method claims of claims 20 and 19, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 19 above.

As to claim 43, it is a computer program product claim of claim 1. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above.

As to claim 44, it is a computer program product claim of claims 17 and 21. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 17 and 21 above.

4. Claims 10-11, 15 and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ankireddipally in view of APA, and further in view of Murray U.S. Patent No. 5,944,781.

As to claim 10, Ankireddipally as modified does not explicitly teach servlet, handler objects and hash table. Murray teaches a system of communication between a client and a server wherein a servlet receiving a request from a client and establishing a connection with a server (...server 52 run servlets originating with server 60. A servlet is a module of executable code downloaded when needed from an independent server to the server interacting with the client..., lines 23-26 column 4); the server registering handler objects and associated methods which were to be invoked by the client wherein references to the handler objects and associated methods are stored in a hash table at the server (...a servlet 212 operates to save and retrieve objects under the control of modified applet viewer 206. Servlet 212 interacts with an object storage database 214. A hash table 216 operates as an index to object storage database 214 listing object names and pointers to database 214..., lines 58-62 column 4). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Murray to the system of Ankireddipally because the servlet establish the communication between the client and server as disclosed by Murray (lines 23-30 column 4).

As to claim 11, Murray further teaches server determines if the method is registered with the server via the hash table (lines 38-47 column 7).

As to claim 15, it is a system claim of claims 1, 10 and 18-19. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 10 and 18-19 above.

As to claim 31, it is a system claim of claims 1, 10 and 13-14. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 10 and 13-14 above.

As to claim 32, it is a system claim of claims 1 and 21. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 21 above.

As to claims 33-34, they are system claims of claims 20 and 26, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 26 above.

As to claims 35-36, they are system claims of claims 20 and 26, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 20 and 26 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 4/14/2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Applicant's arguments presented issues which required the Examiner to further view the previous rejection. The Examiner conducted a further search regarding the issues mentioned in Applicant's response. Therefore, all arguments regarding the cited references of the previous rejection are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2194

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIM) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762


Application/Control Number: 09/828,542

Page 12

Art Unit: 2194

A.H

July 22, 2005


SUE LAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK